

**Tomas A. Guterres, Esq. (State Bar No. 152729)
Catherine M. Mathers, Esq. (State Bar No. 221983)
COLLINS, COLLINS, MUIR & STEWART, LLP
1100 El Centro Street
Post Office Box 250
South Pasadena, CA 91030
(626) 243-1100 – FAX (626) 243-1111
EMAIL: cmathers@ccmslaw.com**

Attorney for Defendant
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT**

HELEN and MARTIN YACK on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

WASHINGTON MUTUAL INC.,
SUNLAN-020105, LLC;
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
CALIFORNIA; CLERK'S OFFICE,
COUNTY OF BUTTE,
CALIFORNIA; and DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

) CASE NO. CV07-5858-PJH
) *[Case Assigned to the Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton, Courtroom 3]*
)
) DEFENDANT COUNTY OF LOS
) ANGELES SHERIFF'S
) DEPARTMENT'S REPLY TO
) PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO
) MOTION TO DISMISS
)
) DATE: June 25, 2008
) TIME: 9:00 a.m.
) CTRM: 3
)
) Complaint Filed: November 19, 2007
)
) TRIAL DATE: None
)

111

111

111

111

111

1
I.2
INTRODUCTION3
Plaintiffs HELEN and MARTIN YACK (hereinafter "PLAINTIFFS") oppose
4
the Motion to Dismiss of Defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES SHERIFF'S
5
DEPARTMENT (hereinafter "LASD") on the grounds that (1) PLAINTIFFS have
6
alleged a "custom, practice or policy" of violating constitutional rights of Social
7
Security recipients by enforcing an attachment procedure which violated due process;
8
(2) it is not necessary to allege a custom, practice, or policy when seeking to enjoin the
9
Sheriff from enforcing a statute which is allegedly unconstitutional as applied; and (3)
10
PLAINTIFFS do not lack standing.11
However, PLAINTIFFS' Amended Complaint sets forth nothing more than
12
conclusory allegations that their rights were violated by virtue of LASD following the
13
requirements of the California Code of Civil Procedure. PLAINTIFFS' Amended
14
Complaint is entirely lacking of allegations of a policy promulgated by LASD which
15
caused a violation of their constitutional rights. Additionally, PLAINTIFFS rely
16
heavily on Chaloux v. Killeen, 886 F.2d 247 (9th Cir. 1989). However, as set forth
17
herein, Chaloux does not apply to actions for damages. Further, PLAINTIFFS
18
apparently did not carefully read LASD's Motion to Dismiss as they represent to the
19
Court that LASD "apparently concedes that the Yacks have pled a valid claim against
20
them for Due Process and Supremacy Clause violations of the United States
21
Constitution." (PLAINTIFFS' Opposition, p.2, footnote 1). As set forth herein and in
22
the moving papers, LASD contends that all of PLAINTIFFS' causes of action against
23
LASD should be dismissed.24
II.25
CHALOUX v. KILLEEN DOES NOT APPLY TO
PLAINTIFFS' CLAIM FOR DAMAGES26
While LASD agrees that Chaloux v. Killeen, 886 F.2d 247, 251 (9th Cir. 1989)
27
holds that it is not necessary to allege an "official policy or custom" requirement when
28

1 seeking **only** prospective relief, that is not the case here. PLAINTIFFS' Amended
 2 Complaint lacks clarity as to the relief sought for each specific cause of action.
 3 However, in the prayer for relief, PLAINTIFFS seek a judgment "awarding
 4 compensatory, statutory and punitive damages in favor of Plaintiffs and the other
 5 Class Members against Defendants for all damages sustained as a result of the
 6 Defendants' wrongdoing, in an amount to be established at trial..." (PLAINTIFF's
 7 Amended Complaint, p. 15, lines 16-17).

8 Therefore, to the extent that PLAINTIFFS seek monetary relief, as set forth in
 9 the moving papers, PLAINTIFFS' causes of action for violation of constitutional
 10 rights must fail as PLAINTIFFS do not specify facts to support a custom, practice, or
 11 policy promulgated by LASD that violated their constitutional rights. (See Gibson v.
 12 United States, 781 F.2d 1334, 1337 (9th Cir. 1986); Palmerin v. Riverside, 794 F.2d
 13 1409, 1414 (9th Cir. 1986)). Accordingly, PLAINTIFF's claims under 42 U.S.C. §
 14 1983 must fail.

15 **III.**

16 **PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT PROPERLY ALLEGED**
 17 **A CLAIM FOR EQUITABLE RELIEF**

18 To maintain an action for equitable relief, PLAINTIFFS must have standing in
 19 order to satisfy the requirement that there is a case or controversy. (See O'Shea v.
 20 Littleton, 414 U.S. 488, 496, 94 S. Ct. 669, 38 L. Ed. 2d 674 (1974); Baker v. Carr,
 21 369 U.S. 186, 204, 82 S. Ct. 691, 7 L. Ed. 2d 663 (1962)). Additionally,
 22 PLAINTIFFS must show that it is likely that the statute they are seeking to have
 23 declared improper will be enforced against PLAINTIFFS in the future. Evers v.
 24 Dwyer, 358 U.S. 202, 203, 79 S. Ct. 178, 3 L. Ed. 2d 222 (1958).

25 Other than conclusory allegations in the Amended Complaint and the
 26 Opposition, PLAINTIFFS have failed to allege how the California statutes conflict
 27 with 42 U.S.C. 407. Additionally, as set forth in all Defendants' moving papers, it
 28 appears that PLAINTIFFS lack standing to bring this lawsuit as the claims were not

1 properly disclosed in their bankruptcy petition. Additionally, PLAINTIFFS have not
 2 alleged any facts to indicate that the California statutes addressing attachment will be
 3 enforced against them in the future. Accordingly, PLAINTIFFS have not alleged a
 4 claim for damages *or* equitable relief and LASD's Motion to Dismiss should be
 5 granted in its entirety.

6 **IV.**

7 **PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT ALLEGED A VIOLATION OF**
 8 **THEIR RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS**

9 As set forth in the moving papers, “[i]n procedural due process claims, the
 10 deprivation by state action of a constitutionally protected interest in ‘life, liberty, or
 11 property’ is not in itself unconstitutional; what is unconstitutional is the deprivation of
 12 such an interest *without due process of law.*” (Emphasis added.) (Internal citations
 13 omitted.) Zinermon v. Burch, 494 U.S. 113, 125, 110 S.Ct. 975, 108 L.Ed.2d 100
 14 (1990).

15 Here, as PLAINTIFFS have alleged, California Code of Civil Procedure §
 16 704.080 guarantees that the funds in PLAINTIFFS' account with Washington Mutual
 17 Bank could not be taken without review by a court. Here, the process provided by
 18 California law successfully prohibited the removal of PLAINTIFFS' exempt funds.
 19 Thus, PLAINTIFFS' rights to due process of law were satisfied.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 V.
2

3 **CONCLUSION**
4

5 For the reasons set forth herein and in the moving papers of all Defendants,
6 LASD respectfully requests that this Court grant its Motion to Dismiss. LASD further
7 requests any relief that this Court deems just and proper.
8

9 DATED: June 11, 2008
10

11 COLLINS, COLLINS, MUIR & STEWART, LLP
12

13 By: /s/ Catherine M. Mathers
14 TOMAS A. GUTERRES
15 CATHERINE M. MATHERS
16 Attorneys for Defendant
17 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
18 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE
(CCP §§ 1013(a) and 2015.5)

State of California,)
) ss.
County of Los Angeles)

I am employed in the County of **Los Angeles** **Orange**, State of California.
I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is:

1100 El Centro Street, Post Office Box 250, South Pasadena, California 91030.

620 Newport Center Drive, Suite 200, Newport Beach, CA 92660-8002

On this date, I served the foregoing document described as **DEFENDANT COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT'S REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS** on the interested parties in this action by placing same in a sealed envelope, addressed as follows:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

- (BY MAIL)** - I caused such envelope(s) with postage thereon fully prepaid to be placed in the United States mail in **South Pasadena/Newport Beach**, California. I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at: **South Pasadena/Newport Beach**, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.
- (BY CERTIFIED MAIL)** – I caused such envelope(s) with postage thereon fully prepaid via Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested to be placed in the United States Mail in **South Pasadena**, California.
- BY EXPRESS MAIL OR ANOTHER METHOD OF DELIVERY PROVIDING FOR OVERNIGHT DELIVERY**
- (BY ELECTRONIC FILING AND/OR SERVICE)** – I served a true copy, with all exhibits, electronically on designated recipients listed on the attached Service List.
- FEDERAL EXPRESS** - I caused the envelope to be delivered to an authorized courier or driver authorized to receive documents with delivery fees provided for.
- (BY FACSIMILE)** - I caused the above-described document(s) to be transmitted to the offices of the interested parties at the facsimile number(s) indicated on the attached Service List and the activity report(s) generated by facsimile number **(626)243-1111 (So. Pasadena) or (949) 718-4801 (Newport Beach)** indicated all pages were transmitted.
- (BY PERSONAL SERVICE)** - I caused such envelope(s) to be delivered by hand to the office(s) of the addressee(s).

/s/ Veronica Chavez
VERONICA CHAVEZ

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
YACK v. COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, et al.
USDC Case No. 07-5858-PJH
Our File No. 16836

8
9
10
11
12
SERVICE LIST

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Dean D. Paik, Esq.
COHEN & PAIK LLP
300 Montgomery Street, Suite 660
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 398-3900 – FAX: (415) 398-7500

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
James F. McCabe, Esq.
Adriano Hrvatin, Esq.
Sarah E. Griswold, Esq.
MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 268-7000 – FAX: (415) 268-7522

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT WASHINGTON
MUTUAL BANK

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Paul S. Grobman, Esq.
555 Fifth Avenue, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10017
(212) 983-5880 – FAX: (212) 682-7060

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Tomio B. Narita, Esq.
Robin M. Bowen, Esq.
SIMMONDS & NARITA, LLP
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3010
San Francisco, CA 94104-4811
(415) 283-1000 – FAX: (415) 352-2625

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT SUNLANT-
020105, LLC